

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Omar Hernandez,

Plaintiff

v.

Romeo Aranas, et al.,

Defendants

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00102-JAD-BNW

**Order Granting Requests to Extend Time
but Denying Motion for Screening Order**

[ECF Nos. 51, 54]

Plaintiff Omar Hernandez's extended deadline to file his first amended complaint was April 6, 2020, but on that date, he again moved to extend that deadline—this time for another 10 days—but then filed his first amended complaint the following day on April 7, 2020. Good cause appearing, Hernandez's motion for a second extension of time **[ECF No. 51]** is **GRANTED** *nunc pro tunc* to April 6, 2020, and his first amended complaint [ECF No. 52] is deemed timely filed.

Defendants move the court to screen that amended complaint because it exceeds the scope of amendment permitted.¹ Because this action has already been through screening once the parties have already participated in an unsuccessful inmate early mediation conference, and the court finds that the most efficient method to address problems that defendants perceive in the amended complaint is by motion to dismiss, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Screening Order and Request for Extension of Time to File Answer or Response to the First Amended Complaint **[ECF No. 54]** is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part: the request for a screening order is denied, and defendants have until June 11, 2020, to answer**

¹ ECF No. 54.

1 or otherwise respond (including by motion to dismiss) to the first amended complaint [ECF
2 No. 52].

3 Dated: May 27, 2020

4 
U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey